UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,326	01/23/2004	Wayne J. Tollett	087-0001	8318

7590 10/17/2007

Wayne J. Tollett
Spicewood Software, LLC
919 Johnson Way
Spicewood, TX 78669

EXAMINER	
TAKELE, MESEKER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/764,326	TOLLETT, WAYNE J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Meseker Takele	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-114* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-114* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: "claim I" should be "claim 1" Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 26-28, 46 and 55-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. ("Nakanishi" US Pub No.: 2004/0088183) in view of Wachtel (US Patent No.: 6,847,974).

As to claim 1, Nakanishi discloses a functional encoding for operating on one or more objects of an encapsulation provided over a network (paragraph [0007], [0008] and [0057]), the functional encoding comprising (see abstract):

an input accumulation encoding operable to accumulate an input sequence (paragraph [0011], [0168] and [0118]);

and input location encoding operable to determine if a member of an object includes the accumulated input sequence, wherein the input location encoding operates within the encapsulation (paragraph [0000])

and a selection encoding operable to supply an indication of a member of an object if the member includes an input sequence accumulated by the input accumulation encoding (paragraph [0194]).

However Nakanishi does not explicitly disclose wherein the functional encoding is in accordance with a specification for hyper object presentation and hyper object input handling.

Wachtel from the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the functional encoding is in accordance with a specification for hyper object presentation and hyper object input handling (col., 1 lines, 15-24 and col., 6 lines, 60-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's computer-readable information medium at the time the invention was made with hyper object as taught by Wachtel.

The motivation to combine to provide allow an intelligent data assimilation system hosted by the general purpose computer to communicate via a computer network such as the Internet with other software objects on the computer network.

As to claim 2, Wachtel discloses wherein the specification includes an interpreted language, a scripting language, and a virtual machine language (example, such as language such as Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) see col., 1 line, 20).

As to claim 3, Nakanishi discloses wherein the functional encoding is encoded integrally with the encapsulation (paragraph [0007] and [0008]).

As to claim 4, Wachtel discloses wherein the web page control is encoded integrally with a template for the encapsulation (col., 2 lines, 58-62).

As to claim 5, Wachtel discloses, wherein the encapsulation template includes cascading style sheets (col., 6 lines, 62-63).

As to claim 26, Nakanishi discloses a web page control that, upon evaluation thereof, locates a web page object member that includes a user provided sequence (paragraph [0106]).

However Nakanishi does not explicitly disclose wherein the locating refines evaluation of the web page object against the user provided sequence as successive elements of the user provided sequence are accumulated, and that supplies indication of the object member that includes the user provided sequence.

Wachtel from the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the locating refines evaluation of the web page object against the user provided sequence as successive elements of the user provided sequence are accumulated, and that supplies indication of the object member that includes the user provided sequence (col.8, lines, 44-50, col., 5 lines, 61-67 and col., 6 lines, 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Wachtel.

The motivation to combine provide data mapping tools to add semantic intelligence to atomic data with the purpose of providing users the ability to manipulate LSO results.

As to claim 27, Wachtel discloses wherein the web page control is instantiated in the web page as functionality of the object (col., 6 lines, 34-39).

As to claim 28, Nakanishi discloses wherein the web page control is embodied, at least in part, as a functional sequence over loadable for corresponding functionality of the object (paragraph [0181]).

As to claim 46, Nakanishi discloses a web page that searches an object with an input sequence of elements accumulated within a period of time ([0011], [0168] and [0118]) and

that selects an object member that includes the accumulated input sequence, wherein the web page encapsulates at least the object (paragraph [0194]).

However Nakanishi doe not explicitly disclose input sequence of elements accumulated within a period of time.

Wachtel from the same field of endeavor disclose input sequence of elements accumulated within a period of time (col., 13 line, 40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Wachtel.

The motivation to combine provide data mapping tools to add semantic intelligence to atomic data with the purpose of providing users the ability to manipulate LSO results.

As to claim 55, Nakanishi disclose a method (paragraph [0007]) comprising:

recording a locally provided sequence of elements (paragraph [0011], [0168] and [0118])

searching a remotely provided encapsulated object for an object member that includes the locally provided sequence of elements (paragraph [0008], [0011] and [0120]).

However Nakanishi does not explicitly disclose supplying indication of the object member that includes the locally provided sequence of elements.

Wachtel from the same field of endeavor disclose supplying indication of the object member that includes the locally provided sequence of elements (col., 18 lines, 34-40 and col., 13 line, 40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Wachtel.

The motivation to combine provide data mapping tools to add semantic intelligence to atomic data with the purpose of providing users the ability to manipulate LSO results.

Claim 56, is similar in scope to claim 25 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 57, is similar in scope to claim 22 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 58, is similar in scope to claim 29 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 59-61, are similar in scope to claims 14-16 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 62-63, are similar in scope to claims 19-20 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 64, is similar in scope to claim 18 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 65-66, are similar in scope to claim 6 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 67, is similar in scope to claim 44 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 68, Nakanishi discloses embodied as a computer program product encoded in one or more machine-readable media (see Nakanishi, [0035]).

As to claim 69, Nakanishi discloses a method comprising: location of members of objects of an encapsulation, to accumulate in the encapsulation locally provided sequences, and to locate within the encapsulation an encapsulated object member that includes the locally provided sequence (paragraph [0007], [0008] and [0009]).

However Nakanishi does not disclose defining an object property, which controls access.

Wachtel from the same field of endeavor disclose defining an object property, which controls access (col.25, lines, 21-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Wachtel.

The motivation to combine provide data mapping tools to add semantic intelligence to atomic data with the purpose of providing users the ability to manipulate LSO results.

Claims 70-71, are similar in scope to claim 19-20 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 72, is similar in scope to claim 18 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 69, Nakanishi discloses wherein the remotely provided encapsulated objects collectively provide one or more of content presentation, service provision, and an application ([0007], [0177], [0157].

As to claim 74, Nakanishi discloses wherein the remotely provided encapsulated objects are provided from one or more sources within a .Net framework (paragraph [0052]).

Claim 75, is similar in scope to claim 6 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 76, is similar in scope to claim 6 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 77, is similar in scope to claim 44 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 78, Wachtel discloses wherein the object property definition refers to a component (col., 5 lines, 22-25).

As to claim 79, Wachtel discloses wherein the component encapsulates functionality to define object behavior (col., 9 line, 1).

Claim 80, is similar in scope to claim 2 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 81, Wachtel discloses wherein a first object accumulates locally provided sequences and searches a second object (col., 2 lines, 24-30).

Claim 82, is similar in scope to claim 68 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 6-25, 29-45, 47-54 and 92-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. ("Nakanishi", US Pub No.: 2004/0088183) in view of Wachtel (US Patent No.: 6,847,974) and in further in view of Leitermann (US Pub No.: 2004/0030692).

As to claim 6, the modified Nakanishi does not disclose further comprising an expansion encoding operable to determine a greatest dimension of members of an object, to increase the object to at least the determined greatest dimension from an initial dimension.

Leitermann from the same field of endeavor disclose further comprising an expansion encoding operable to determine a greatest dimension of members of an object, to increase the

object to at least the determined greatest dimension from an initial dimension (Figure 60 and [0261]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nakanishi's teaching with the modified Nakanishi at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Leitermann.

The motivation to combine provide for preselect big amounts of data automatically enabling the user to find relevant information easily.

As to claim 7, Leitermann discloses wherein the expansion encoding reduces the object to the initial dimension upon a focus change event (Figure 60).

As to claim 8, Leitermann discloses wherein the expansion encoding increases the object when the object is active and reduces the object when the object is no longer active (Figure 60).

As to claim 9, Leitermann discloses wherein the expansion encoding determines the greatest dimension in accordance with at least one criterion that includes one or more of object member type, object member style, and number of object member elements (Figure 60 and paragraph [0130]).

As to claim 10, Leitermann discloses wherein the member includes a character string and the criteria include one or more of font, number of characters, style, case, and type of characters (paragraph [0221]).

As to claim 11, Leitermann discloses wherein the dimension includes one or more of height and width of the object (Figure 60).

As to claim 12, Leitermann discloses further comprising the expansion encoding to determine a greatest second dimension and to increase the object to the greatest second dimension from an initial second dimension (Figure 60).

As to claim 13, Leitermann discloses wherein the input is accumulated in a first object and the input location encoding operates on a second object (Figure 60).

As to claim 14, Leitermann discloses wherein the second object is hidden (Figure 60 (element input field)).

As to claim 15, Leitermann discloses, wherein the hidden object is revealed while the first object is active (Figure 60 (element output field)).

As to claim 16, Leitermann discloses, wherein the second object is embedded within a third object, and the first object accesses the second object with an object indication based at least in part on the third object's indication, wherein the third object is bound to the first object (Figure 60 and Figure 70).

As to claim 17, Leitermann discloses wherein during input accumulation and input location, the first object is active and the second object is inactive (Figure 60 (element input)).

As to claim 18, Leitermann discloses wherein the object includes one or more of a select object, a table object, an input object, and a graphic object (Figure 60, 76, and 81).

As to claim 19,Wachtel discloses wherein the encapsulation is encoded in accordance with a hierarchically encoded mark-up language (col., 1 line, 20).

As to claim 20,Wachtel discloses wherein the hierarchically encoded mark-up language includes one or more of hypertext markup language; standard generalized mark-up language,

dynamic hypertext mark-up language, server-parse d hypertext mark-up language, and extensible mark-up language (col.5, lines, 45-55).

Claim 21, is similar in scope to claim 18 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 22, Wachtel discloses the input accumulation encoding operable to discard the accumulated input upon expiration of a period of time (col., 7 lines, 45-60).

As to claim 23, Wachtel discloses, wherein the accumulated input includes a sequence of symbols elected from an ordered set thereof (Figure 12 and paragraph [0034]).

As to claim 24, Nakanishi discloses wherein the symbols are encoded in accordance with one or more of ASCII encoding and Unicode encoding (paragraph [0126]).

As to claim 25, Nakanishi discloses wherein the network includes one or more of an intranet and the Internet (paragraph [0002] and [0230]).

As to claim 29, Nakanishi and Wachtel does not explicitly disclose, wherein the web page control accumulates the user provided sequence in a second object, accesses the object, locates the object member with the user provided sequence accumulated in the second object, and supplies indication of the located object member (see Leitermann Figure 60).

Leitermann from the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the web page control accumulates the user provided sequence in a second object, accesses the object, locates the object member with the user provided sequence accumulated in the second object, and supplies indication of the located object member (see Leitermann Figure 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's and Wachtel's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Leitermann.

The motivation to combine provide for preselect big amounts of data automatically enabling the user to find relevant information easily.

Claims 30-31, are similar in scope to claims 15-16 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 32, Leitermann discloses wherein the web page includes an object property defined to comply with the web page control (paragraph [0029]).

Claim 33, is similar in scope to claim 19 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 34, is similar in scope to claim 20 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 35-38, are similar in scope to claims 2-5 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 39-40, are similar in scope to claims 23-24 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 41, is similar in scope to claim 18 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 42-43, are similar in scope to claims 6-7 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 44, Wachtel discloses wherein the event includes one or more of a pointing device selection of an object member, a key input selection of an object member, and a move focus event (col., 6, lines, 10-20 and col., 24, lines, 4-9)).

Claim 45, is similar in scope to claim 22 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 47, Nakanishi does not explicitly disclose that also determines a greatest dimension from the object members and that increases the object from an initial dimension to at least the greatest dimension, which allows presentation of one or more object members with the greatest dimension, when focus is on the object, and that reduces the object to the initial dimension upon a change event.

Leitermann from the same field of endeavor disclose that also determines a greatest dimension from the object members and that increases the object from an initial dimension to at least the greatest dimension, which allows presentation of one or more object members with the greatest dimension, when focus is on the object, and that reduces the object to the initial dimension upon a change event (Figure 60 and paragraph [0261]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's computer-readable information medium at the time the invention was made with one dimensional as taught by Leitermann.

The motivation to combine provide for pre select big amounts of data automatically enabling the user to find relevant information easily.

Claim 48, is similar in scope to claim 44 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 49, is similar in scope to claim 10 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 50, is similar in scope to claim 29 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 51, is similar in scope to claim 18 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 52, is similar in scope to claim 22 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 53, Nakanishi discloses encoded in accordance with one or more of HTML, SHTML, SGML, XML, and DHTML (paragraph [0231]).

As to claim 54, Wachtel discloses wherein the input sequence includes one or more of alphanumeric characters, symbols, and biometric data (col., 5 lines, 40-45).

As to claim 92, Nakanishi discloses functional encoding (paragraph [0007], [0008] and [0057] and see abstract.

However Nakanishi does not explicitly discloses locally manipulating objects within an encapsulation.

Wachtel from the same field of endeavor disclose locally manipulating objects within an encapsulation (col., 5 lines, 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Wachtel.

The motivation to combine provide data mapping tools to add semantic intelligence to atomic data with the purpose of providing users the ability to manipulate LSO results.

However Nakanishi and Wachtel does not explicitly discloses a maximum dimension encoding operable to determine greatest dimension that accommodates a largest object member;

and a resize encoding operable to expand an encapsulated object from an initial dimension to a maximum dimension determined by the maximum dimension encoding and to reduce the encapsulated object to the initial dimension.

Leitermann from the same field of endeavor disclose a maximum dimension encoding operable to determine greatest dimension that accommodates a largest object member; and a resize encoding operable to expand an encapsulated object from an initial dimension to a maximum dimension determined by the maximum dimension encoding and to reduce the encapsulated object to the initial dimension (Figure 60 and [0261]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's and Wachtel's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Leitermann.

The motivation to combine provide for preselect big amounts of data automatically enabling the user to find relevant information easily.

Claims 93-94 are similar in scope to claims 27-28 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 95-96, are similar in scope to claims 19-20 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 97-99, are similar in scope to claims 3-5 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 100, is similar in scope to claim 11 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 101, is similar in scope to claim 10 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 102, is similar in scope to claim 44 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 103, is similar in scope to claim 1 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 104, is similar in scope to claim 22 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 105, is similar in scope to claim 16 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 106, Nakanishi disclose the functional encoding of claim 105, wherein the encapsulation includes a web page (paragraph [0003]).

Claim 107, is similar in scope to claim 87 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 108, is similar in scope to claim 6 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 109, is similar in scope to claim 29 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 83-84 and 110-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. (US Pub No.: 2004/0088183) in view of Leitermann (US Pub No.: 2004/0030692).

As to claim 83, Nakanishi discloses a method comprising: activating an encapsulated object that has been remotely provided ([0007], [0008], [0009] and [0010].

However Nakanishi does not discloses expanding the encapsulated object from an initial dimension to a greater dimension, wherein the greater dimension accommodates a largest object member; and reducing the encapsulated object to the initial dimension, wherein at least the encapsulated object is within an encapsulation.

Leitermann from the same field of endeavor disclose expanding the encapsulated object from an initial dimension to a greater dimension, wherein the greater dimension accommodates a largest object member; and reducing the encapsulated object to the initial dimension, wherein at least the encapsulated object is within an encapsulation (Figure 60 and [0261]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Leitermann.

The motivation to combine provide for preselect big amounts of data automatically enabling the user to find relevant information easily.

As to claim 84, Leitermann discloses further comprising determining the greater dimension in accordance with criteria that include one or more of object member element size, number of object member elements, type of object member element, and style of object member element (Figure 60).

As to claim 110, Nakanishi disclose an apparatus comprising: a network interface (paragraph [0042]), an encapsulated object within the encapsulation (paragraph [0007], [0008] and [0009].

However Nakanishi does not explicitly disclose means for modifying at least one dimension of object to accommodate a largest object member.

Leitermann from the same field of endeavor disclose modifying at least one dimension of object to accommodate a largest object member (paragraph [0182] and [0262]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Leitermann.

The motivation to combine provide for preselect big amounts of data automatically enabling the user to find relevant information easily.

As to claim 111, Wachtel discloses wherein the means further comprise restoring the encapsulated object to maintain integrity of the encapsulation (col., 6 lines, 28-33).

Claim 113, is similar in scope to claim 22 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 114, is similar in scope to claim 16 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 114, Nakanishi disclose further comprising means for controlling the encapsulated object from an input object within the encapsulation ([paragraph 0007], [0008] and [0009]).

6. Claims 85-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. (US Pub No.: 2004/0088183) in view of Leitermann (US Pub No.: 2004/0030692) and further in view of Wachtel (US Patent No.: 6,847,974).

As to claim 85, Nakanishi does not explicitly disclose wherein the encapsulation is encoded in accordance with a mark-up language.

Wachtel from the same field of endeavor disclose wherein the encapsulation is encoded in accordance with a mark-up language (col., 1 line, 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakanishi's teaching at the time the invention was made with the teaching of Wachtel.

The motivation to combine an ontology description of a data service a first logical search object operably coupled via a first communications link to a data provider.

Claim 86, is similar in scope to claim 44 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 87, Nakanishi discloses further comprising: accumulating a locally provided input sequence with the encapsulation (paragraph [0007] and [0008]); and searching the encapsulated object for an object member that includes the accumulated locally provided input sequence (paragraph [0009] and [0010].

As to claim 88, Wachtel discloses further comprising supplying an indication of an object member that includes the accumulated locally provided input sequence (col., 18 lines, 34-40 and col., 13 line, 40).

Claim 89, is similar in scope to claim 22 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 90, is similar in scope to claim 29 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 91, is similar in scope to claim 68 respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meseker Takele whose telephone number is (571) 270-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30AM- 5:00PM est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sy D. Luu
Sy D. Luu
Primary Examiner

MT